

REMARKS

The abstract has been objected to in the Office Action. A new abstract has been provided. No new matter has been added.

Claims 4-6 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Claim 4 has been amended accordingly. With respect to claims 5 and 6, the term “the object” is referring back to “an object” from a display in claim 4. The terms “object computer” and “object processing” platform are separate. No clarification is required.

Claims 4-5 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Khoo in view of Okahara; and claim 6 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Khoo in view of Okahara, further in view of Trueblood. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

The invention is related to recognition that there exist technologies to output data on an ad hoc screen assembly, but that there is little to nothing known to input data, particularly transfer objects between computers, in a more convenient and user-friendly way. In an embodiment of the invention, an add hoc screen assembly is performed between two distinct computers – an object computer and a processing computer - in order to couple their input and/or output device (for example, displays and pointing devices), and then activating a local file processing function by moving an object from the first display belonging to the object computer to the second display belonging to the processing computer.

Khoo is related to a portable computing device having at least two separate portable device coupled over a wireless link. Khoo deals specifically with the limitations of an input device of a mobile device, e.g. limited keyboard which does not comprise all characters of a full-size conventional keyboard. To overcome this problem Khoo proposes to couple the mobile keyboard with the keyboard of a second device and assign some characters of the full-size conventional reference keyboard to the mobile keyboard and the rest to the keyboard of the second device. However, Khoo fails to disclose performing an ad hoc screen assembly by the object computer with the processing computer in order to couple their input and/or output device, activating a local file processing function, and moving an object from a display belonging to the object computer to the display belonging to the processing computer, as required by the claimed invention. And, as noted by the Examiner, Khoo fails to disclose generating an object processing platform by moving an object from a display belonging to the object computer to the interaction

area of the display belonging to the processing computer.

Okahara discloses a terminal operation apparatus for an electronic conference, in which an operated terminal has a shared screen remotely operated through a network. In this context, the conference system enables movement of a pointing device on one display to be moved synchronously and displayed on another display of the conference. The Examiner cites Fig. 13 and [0206] - [0208] as disclosing continuous synchronization if on both displays a specific conference window is used and the pointer device moves in and out of these windows. This is accomplished by predefined entry points, where the pointer devices appear on the corresponding display if they enter the conference window on the other display. However, Okahara fails to disclose that the pointer device can be used to move an object from a display belonging to one computer to the display belonging to another computer, nor to use the moved object for activating a local file processing function. Moreover, the displays of the terminals of the conference do not perform an ad hoc screen assembly in order to couple their input and/or output device of two distinct computers (the contents of one conference window is only copied to the display of the conference partner which does not render the two displays a screen assembly).

Additionally, one cannot use hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the prior art to deprecate the claimed invention.” *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 1075 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Even if all its limitations could be found in the total set of elements contained in the prior art references, a claimed invention would not be obvious without a demonstration of the existence of a motivation to combine those references at the time of the invention. “To reach a non-hindsight driven conclusion as to whether a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have viewed the subject matter as a whole to have been obvious in view of multiple references, the Board must provide some rationale, articulation, or reasoned basis to explain why the conclusion of obviousness is correct.” *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977, 987 (Fed. Cir. 2006).

In view of the above, Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. An indication of the same is solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account 02-1818 for any fees which are due and owing, referencing Attorney Docket No 112740-1133.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLP

BY 

Kevin R. Spivak

Reg. No. 43,148

Customer No. 29177

Dated: February 28, 2008